

**VALUE ENGINEERING CHANGE PROPOSAL**  
**MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

☐ Conceptual Proposal      ☒ Final Proposal

Date 7/29/10

Contract ID 100514-302

Job No. J3PO792B

County Shelby/Marion

36

Original Bid Cost \$2,997,291.35

Contractor Cedar Valley Corp.

By Gary Forristall

Designed By R. A. Domzalski

Phone 319-290-5600

VECP# 10-78 (to be completed by C.O.)

VECP ☒ or PDVECP ☐

**1. Description of existing requirements and proposed change(s). Advantages/Disadvantages**

The project plans call for a temporary access to be constructed at log mile 167.717. This access is for the Maher Bros. grain facility. The work involves placing a drainage pipe, grading and placing aggregate surfacing, shouldering, and then removal upon completion of the project. It would be in the best interest of the project for this access drive to be eliminated. Truck traffic entering and leaving the facility would be an obstacle to the high speed traffic on Route 36 with no turn lanes present. Cedar Valley Corp. has made alternate access arrangements with the owner and they concur with this proposal. There are no perceived disadvantages.

\$4525.00

**2. Estimate of reduction in construction costs.**

**3. Prediction of any effects the proposed change(s) will have on other department costs, such as maintenance and operations.**

Since this is a temporary driveway access and will be removed upon completion there will be no effect on maintenance cost or other operations.

**4. Anticipated date for submittal of detailed change(s) of items required by Section 104.6 of the Specifications.**

7/29/2010

(date)

**5. Deadline for issuing a change order to obtain maximum cost reduction, noting the effect of contract completion time or delivery schedule.**

8/16/2010

(date)

no effect

(effect)

**6. Dates of any previous or concurrent submission of the same proposal.**

none

(date and/or dates)

Additional Comments:

**\*\* Portion Below This Line To Be Filled Out by MoDOT \*\***

Comments:

I agree with the V.E. proposal. I have looked into the traffic control and foresee no problems.

  
Submitted By Resident Engineer

7/29/2010  
Date

Comments:

Agree that this VE proposal should benefit project. The contractors are agreeable to this as per contractor. So approval recommended.

- ☒ Approval  
Recommended
- ☐ Rejection  
Recommended

  
District Engineer For Paula Gough

7/30/10  
Date

Comments:

- ☐ Approval  
Recommended
- ☐ Rejection  
Recommended

N/A  
Federal Highway Administration  
Required for FHWA Full Oversight Projects

Date

Comments:

OK, per comments above. Denis Glascock 8/11/2010

- ☒ Approval
- ☐ Rejection

  
State Construction and Materials Engineer

8/11/2010  
Date

Distribution: Resident Engineer, Project Manager, District Construction & Materials Engineer, State Construction & Materials Engineer, FHWA Value Engineering Administrator - MoDOT, P. O. Box 270, Jefferson City, MO 65102



**Cedar Valley Corp.**

2637 Wagner Road  
P.O. Box 1740  
Waterloo, Iowa 50704

July 29, 2010

Jerad Nolan, P.E.  
Resident Engineer, District 3  
Missouri Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 1067  
Hannibal, MO 63401

Re: Route 36, Shelby County  
Contract ID 100514-302  
Job No. J3P0792B  
CVC #10009

Mr. Jerad Nolan:

I have submitted the attached VECP. Following are the quantities that justify the amount submitted:

Item 10 Aggregate surfacing  
Item 30 Linear Grading  
Item 380 Pipe, 15"  
Total

40TN @ \$ 20.00/TN = \$ 800.00  
1STA @ \$2500.00/STA = \$2500.00  
35LF @ \$ 35.00/LF = \$ 1225.00

~~\$4500.00~~

\$ 4525.00

my 7/30/10

Respectfully submitted,

Gary Forristall, P.E.  
Project Manager

319-235-9537

FAX: 319-235-7198

www.cedarvalleycorp.com

*Build with the best!*

# VALUE ENGINEERING CHECK SHEET

## TYPE OF WORK

(Check one that applies)

- ☐ Bridge/Structure/Footings
- ☐ Drainage Structures (RCP, RCB, CMP's, ect.)
- ☐ TCP/MOT
- ☐ Paving (PCCP, ect.)
- ☐ Grading/MSE Walls
- ☐ Signal/Lighting/ITS
- ☒ Misc

## SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

(If needed, condense summary to a couple of lines)

This VE involves altering the design to eliminate an entrance that was superfluous. The landowner agreed with the change.

---

---

---

---

## SCANNING OF DOCUMENT

If the proposal is large, please mark or make note, which pages need to be scanned into the database. If there are special instructions, make note of them here.

---

---

---